



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,252	03/17/2004	Ullas Gargi	200300480-1	5961

22879            7590            09/26/2007  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

DANG, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/803,252	GARGI, ULLAS
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Hung Q. Dang	2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/17/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-35, and 37-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jojic et al. (US Patent 7,152,209).**

Regarding claim 1, Jojic et al. disclose a method for variable speed video playback (column 2, lines 11-23), comprising: obtaining a set of scores for a plurality of discrete segments in a digital video (column 24, lines 10-22); enabling a playback of said digital video at a variable playback speed that may change from segment to segment based on said set of scores (column 12, lines 13-22); receiving a user input to adjust said playback speed for at least one of said segments by modifying at least one of said set of scores (column 11, lines 50-53; column 28, line 66 – column 29, line 1); and adjusting said variable playback speed based on said user input (column 12, lines 8-22; column 24, lines 10-23; column 24, lines 29-39).

Regarding claim 2, Jojic et al. also disclose said scores were computed based on one or more video analysis techniques applied to said segments (column 19, line 59 – column 20, line 26).

Regarding claim 3, Jojic et al. also disclose different ones of said video analysis techniques are given different weights in computing said set of scores (column 20, lines 3-56).

Regarding claim 4, Jojic et al. also disclose said weight for said video analysis technique is given prior to performing said video analysis technique (column 20, lines 3-56 – the function to calculate the likelihood is determined prior to performing the video analysis technique).

Regarding claim 5, Jojic et al. also disclose said weight for said video analysis technique is given after performing said video analysis technique (column 13, lines 24-27; column 20, lines 2-56; the number of blobs is inputted dynamically; the extra blobs or reduced blobs have weights increased from zero to non-zero or from non-zero to zero, respectively).

Regarding claim 7, Jojic et al. also disclose adjusting includes increasing the weight of a video analysis technique if that technique substantially differentiates among said segments (column 21, lines 25-33).

Regarding claim 8, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to modify said weight given to at least one of said video analysis techniques (column 13, lines 24-27; column 20, lines 2-56; the number of blobs is inputted dynamically; the extra blobs or reduced blobs have weights increased from zero to non-zero or from non-zero to zero, respectively).

Regarding claim 9, Jojic et al. also disclose said enabling includes playing a discrete segment of said digital video at a slower speed when said discrete segment

has a high score relative to scores for other discrete segments of said digital video (column 24, lines 19-23).

Regarding claim 10, Jojic et al. also disclose said enabling includes playing a discrete segment of said digital video at a faster speed when said discrete segment has a low score relative to scores for other discrete segments of said digital video (column 24, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 11, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to dampen an effect of said set of scores on said variable playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 12, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to amplify an effect of said set of scores on said variable playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 13, Jojic et al. also disclose said adjusting includes recalculating said variable playback speed based on said input (column 11, lines 50-53; column 28, line 66 – column 29, line 1; column 24, lines 10-23).

Regarding claim 14, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes setting a maximum playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49; by dragging the "slider bar 1350" in Fig. 13 up to the right most position).

Regarding claim 15, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes setting an average playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49; by dragging the "slider bar 1350" in Fig. 13 up to a mid-point position).

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above in further consideration of Jovic et al. also disclosing a user interface module configured to provide said user input to said video playback module (column 27, lines 45-51; "slider bar 1390" in Fig. 13).

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 10 above.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 11 above.

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 12 above.

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 14 above.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 15 above.

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 13 above.

Regarding claim 29, Jovic et al. also disclose an output device configured to display past and future discrete segments in one or more sliding windows (column 12, lines 27-50; column 38, lines 2-11, 18-29).

Regarding claim 30, Jovic et al. also disclose an output device configured to enable a user selection of one or more past and future discrete segments (column 12, lines 27-50; column 38, lines 2-11, 18-29).

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 32 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 30 above.

Claim 33 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 34 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 35 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 37 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 38 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 39 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 40 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 10 above.

Claim 41 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 11 above.

Claim 42 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 12 above.

Claim 43 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 14 above.

Claim 44 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 15 above.

Claim 45 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 13 above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 6, 19, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jovic et al. (US Patent 7,512,209) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-35, and 37-45 above, and further in view of Breese et al. (US Patent 6,144,964).**

Regarding claim 6, see the teachings of Jojic et al. as discussed in claim 3 above. However, Jojic et al. do not disclose reducing the weight of an analysis technique if that technique fails to substantially differentiate among said segments.

Breese et al. disclose a tuning technique that reduces the weight of the component that fail to substantially differentiate among other components (abstract).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the tuning technique disclosed by Breese et al. into the method disclosed by Jojic et al. to enhance the accuracy of the method.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

Claim 36 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Q. Dang whose telephone number is 571-270-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th:7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hung Dang  
Patent Examiner



THAI Q. TRAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600